

REMARKS

Claims 21-29, 31-41, and 43-48 are pending, but stand rejected. Claims 30 and 42 have been cancelled. Claims 21, 22, 31, 32, 33, 35-39, 41, 43, and 44 have been amended.

As is explained below, each claim in the present application requires redirection web pages or the provision of redirection web pages – a limitation not taught or suggested by the references cited by the Examiner in support of the rejections. Each redirection web page serves as an indirect link between information web pages. In other words, when a browser or other terminal accesses a first information web page the browser is presented with a link to a second information web page. That link is a link to a redirection web page for the second information web page. When the link is selected, the browser is directed to the redirection web page which redirects the browser to the second information web page.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 112: The Examiner rejected Claims 21, 32, and 43 for failing to resolve a difference between "an indirect link to another information object" and "an indirect link to an information object". Claims 21, 32, and 43 have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns

The Examiner rejected Claims 22 and 44 noting that the limitation "receiving a request" does not indicate who is receiving a request and that the limitation "returning an instruction" does not indicate to where the instruction is being returned. Claims 22 and 44 have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns. Specifically, the claims were amended to indicate that the request is received from a client terminal and the instruction is returned to the client terminal.

The Examiner rejected Claims 21, 22, 30-35, and 41 asserting that the term "object" has not been clearly defined. Those claims have been amended replacing the term "object" with the phrase "web page."

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 102: The Examiner rejected Claims 21, 22, 30, 31-34, and 42-44 under §102 as being anticipated by USPN 5,933,596 issued to

Mayhew. To properly support a §102, a cited reference must teach or suggest the specific combination of elements required by a claim.

Claim 21 is directed to a method for supplying information. As amended, Claim 21 includes the following combination of elements:

1. distributing a plurality of information web pages across a plurality of servers; and
2. providing a redirection web page for each information web page;
3. wherein each information web pages includes an indirect link to another information web page, the indirect link being a link to a redirection web page for that other information web pages.

The Examiner rejected Claim 21 asserting that Mayhew col. 4, lines 4-63 teaches the second and third elements above. The Examiner's position is flawed. Mayhew does not teach or suggest providing a redirection web page for each information web page. Moreover, Mayhew does not teach including in a first information web page an indirect link to a second information web page where that indirect link is a link to a redirection web page for the second information web page.

An example of a redirection web page is described on page 6, lines 17 through page 7, line 20 of the Specification. In short, a web browser displays an information web page having a link that appears to be a link to a second information web page. That link however is a link to a redirection web page. When the link is selected, the web browser requests the redirection web page. In response, the redirection web page causes the web browser to request the second information web page.

Mayhew, on the other hand, requires dynamically changing links within web pages to "facilitate load balancing across multiple servers containing the same information." Mayhew, col. 2, lines 38-40 and col. 4, lines 51-58. For example, a user browses to a first page supplied by a first server containing links to other web pages or information normally supplied by the first server but copies of which can be served by one of group of alternate servers. Where it is determined that the first server is busy, the first server alters the links in the web page to refer to copies served by one of the

alternate servers. See Mayhew, col. 3, lines 51-58, col. 6, lines 20-54, and Figs. 5A and 5B. Further, Mayhew's title is "Multiple server dynamic page link retargeting."

Mayhew, col. 4, lines 24-63 expands on this theme. More specifically, a user requests a web page located on data server "extern1". Mayhew, col. 4, lines 31-34. That web page includes links to other web pages handled by other data servers. Mayhew, col. 4, lines 31-34. Before returning the requested web page, the data server "extern1" checks the status of the other data servers referenced in the links of the requested web page. Mayhew, col. 4, lines 38-40. If one of the other data servers is "busy" the link referencing the "busy" server is amended to reference an alternate server. Mayhew, col. 4, lines 40-45.

Mayhew provides the following example:

[A] user may access web page <http://w3.extern1.com/xxx.xxx> which has references to w3.extern1.com/xxx.yyy, w3.extern1.com/xxx.zzz, and w3.extern1.com/qqq.xxx. When the page is sent to the requester and the "extern1" (301) data server is busy, the user may receive the web page <http://w3.extern1.com/xxx.xxx> with links to <http://w3.extern2.com/xxx.yyy>, <http://w3.extern2.com/xxx.zzz> and <http://w3.extern2.com/qqq.xxx> for further information.

Mayhew, col. 4, lines 48-56. In other words, the links in the requested web page are dynamically changed.

Mayhew fails to teach or suggest providing a redirection web page for each information web page in the manner required by Claim 21. Moreover, Mayhew does not teach including, in a first information web page, an indirect link to a second information web page where that indirect link is a link to a redirection web page for the second information web page. For at least these reasons, Claim 21 is felt to distinguish over Mayhew. Claims 22 and 31 are also felt to distinguish over Mayhew based on their dependency from Claim 21. Claim 30 has been cancelled.

Claim 32 is directed to an information server system. As amended, Claim 32 includes the following combination of elements.

1. a plurality of servers, each hosting a different information web page;
2. a redirection web page for each information web page;

3. wherein each information web page includes an indirect link to another information web page, the indirect link being a link to a redirection web page for that other information web page.

As made clear above with respect to Claim 21, Mayhew does not teach or suggest providing a redirection web page for each information web page in the manner required by Claim 32. Moreover, Mayhew does not teach including in a first information web page an indirect link to a second information web page where that indirect link is a link to a redirection web page for the second information web page. For at least these reasons, Claim 32 is felt to distinguish over Mayhew. Claims 33 and 34 are also felt to distinguish over Mayhew based on their dependency from Claim 32. Claim 42 has been cancelled.

Claim 43 is directed to a method of providing a website. As amended, Claim 43 includes the following combination of elements.

1. hosting a plurality of information web pages on a plurality of distinct web servers;
and
2. hosting a plurality of redirection web pages on a central web server;
3. wherein each information web page includes an indirect link to another information web page, the indirect link being a link to a redirection web page for that other information web page.

As made clear above with respect to Claim 21, Mayhew does not teach or suggest hosting redirection web pages on a central server in the manner required by Claim 43. Moreover, Mayhew does not teach including in a first information web page an indirect link to a second information web page where that indirect link is a link to a redirection web page for the second information web page. For at least these reasons, Claim 43 is felt to distinguish over Mayhew. Claim 44 is also felt to distinguish over Mayhew based on its dependency from Claim 43.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103: The Examiner rejected Claims 23-29, 35-41, and 45-48 as being unpatentable over Mayhew in view of USPN 6,279,001 issued to DeBettencourt. A requirement for establishing a prima facie case for obviousness is

that the cited references must teach or suggest each and every limitation in a rejected claim. Debettencourt and Mayhew fail to teach or suggest one or more limitations in each of Claims 21-48.

Claims 23-29 are felt to distinguish over the cited references based on their dependency from Claim 21. Claims 35-41 are felt to distinguish over the cited references based on their dependency from Claim 32. Claims 45-48 are felt to distinguish over the cited references based on their dependency from Claim 43.

CONCLUSION: The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 21-29, 31-41, and 43-48 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Allen D. Baker

By 

Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

December 23, 2004